UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

AEVOE CORP., a California corporation,)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No.: 2:12-cv-00053-GMN-NJK
VS.)	ORDER
AE TECH CO., LTD., a Taiwan corporation; S&F Corporation dba SF PLANET)	-
CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation,)	
and GREATSHIELD INC., a Minnesota corporation,)	
Defendants.)	
1-		

Pending before the Court is the Motion for Order to Show Cause RE: Failure to Pay Sanctions Award (ECF Nos. 289, 293) filed by Plaintiff Aevoe Corp. ("Plaintiff"). Defendant AE Tech ("AE Tech") filed a Response (ECF No. 309) and Plaintiff filed a Reply (ECF Nos. 321, 323).

I. **BACKGROUND**

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This motion arises from AE Tech's continued failure to pay the sanctions previously imposed by the Court in November 2012 ("Sanctions Order"). (ECF Nos. 167, 181.) Specifically, the Court previously determined that AE Tech violated the preliminary injunction by selling its "redesigned screen protector products" and that, as a result, "a finding of contempt [was] appropriate." (Order 9:4, ECF No. 65; see also Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 66.) Thereafter, the Court held an evidentiary hearing and ordered additional briefing to determine the appropriate amount of sanctions to award for AE Tech's violation of the preliminary injunction. (See Order, ECF No. 132.)

After the evidentiary hearing, the Court imposed a monetary sanction in the amount of \$1,140,701.83 to be paid by AE Tech to Plaintiff. (Order, ECF Nos. 167, 181.) This amount

represented the lost profits suffered by Plaintiff because of AE Tech's violation of the
preliminary injunction (\$1,079,760.08) and the reasonable attorneys' fees that Plaintiff incurred
in connection with AE Tech's contempt (\$60,941.75). (*See id.*) Notably, the Court filed the
Sanctions Order on November 28, 2012. (*Id.*) Nevertheless, more than fifteen months have
passed and AE Tech has still not yet complied with the Sanctions Order. For this reason,
Plaintiff filed the instant Motion for an Order to Show Cause why AE Tech has failed to
comply with this Court's Sanctions Order. (ECF Nos. 289, 293.)

II. <u>DISCUSSION</u>

"Absent a stay, all orders and judgments of courts must be complied with promptly." *In re Crystal Palace Gambling Hall, Inc.*, 817 F.2d 1361, 1365 (9th Cir. 1987) (internal quotation marks omitted). Importantly, AE Tech's disagreement with the Sanctions Order does not warrant AE Tech's failure to comply with that Order. Similarly, the interim decisions by the USPTO in the parallel reexamination proceedings are also irrelevant to AE Tech's duty to comply with an order of the Court. *See id.* ("A party cannot disobey a court order and later argue that there were 'exceptional circumstances' for dong so."). Accordingly, even to the extent that AE Tech believed that changed circumstances warranted reconsideration, modification, or a stay of the Sanctions Order, noncompliance with a Court Order is an ill-advised manner in which to assert these beliefs.

For these reasons, the Court hereby orders AE Tech to Show Cause why AE Tech has not yet complied with the Court's November 2012 Sanctions Order. A Show Cause Hearing is hereby set for **Thursday**, **April 10**, **2014**, **at 2:00 PM**. Both parties shall first meet and confer in an attempt to resolve this issue. In addition, the parties shall *jointly* file, by Monday, April 7, 2014, a Joint Statement certifying that such meet and confer occurred and notifying the Court whether the matter is resolved and whether the hearing may be vacated. At the Show Cause Hearing, AE Tech shall be prepared to present alternative payment options, including a date on

which payment shall commence, and, if necessary, be prepared to present evidence on AE Tech's inability to pay the sanctions.

III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Show Cause (ECF Nos. 289, 293) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a Show Cause Hearing is set for Thursday, April 10, 2014, at 2:00 PM at which AE Tech shall Show Cause why it has not yet complied with the Court's November 2012 Sanctions Order and how and when AE Tech intends to comply in the future.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, prior to the Show Cause Hearing, the parties shall meet and confer in an attempt to resolve this issue. The parties shall *jointly* file, by Monday, April 7, 2014 a Joint Statement certifying that such a meet and confer occurred and notifying the Court whether the matter is resolved and whether the hearing may be vacated.

DATED this _____ day of March, 2014.

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge United States District Judge